REMARKS

This preliminary amendment is submitted with a request for continued examination. Claims 1 and 4-10 are pending. Claims 2 and 3 were previously canceled. The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 4, 5, and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 7,100,172 to Voellm et al. ("Voellm") in view of and U.S. Pat. No. 7,047,537 to Stern ("Stern"). Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voellm in view of Stern and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,974,470.

Applicants have made clarifying amendments to several claims as set forth in the above listing of amended claims in order to more particularly and distinctly claim various embodiments of the invention. These amendments are fully supported by the originally filed specification. New Claims 11-22 have been added and are fully supported by the originally filed specification. In light of the amendments and subsequent remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

The Rejection of Independent Claim 1 under §103(a) is Overcome

Independent Claim 1 is alleged to be unpatentable over the combination of Voellm and Stern. In the Request for Reconsideration filed on June 22, 2010 in response to the final Office Action, Applicants traversed the rejection and submitted arguments pointing out with particularity patentable distinctions between the embodiment claimed in Claim 1 and the cited references, taken alone or in combination. The Office responded with an Advisory Action in which the Examiner noted that "using the relocation instructions in the DLL to modify the export data table of the DLL" was not recited in Claim 1. The Examiner then proceeded to allege that the recited feature "using the relocation instruction to insert into the export data table the address location for the function in the further dynamic link library" is taught by the cited references.

While Applicants respectfully disagree with the arguments presented in the Advisory Action, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to clarify that "the relocation instruction modifies the export data table at least in part by inserting into the export data table the address location for the function in the further dynamic link library." It will be appreciated that Claim 1 additionally

recites that the relocation instruction and the export data table are included in the remapping component. Further, the specification discloses embodiments wherein the remapping component is "in the form of a DLL." *See,* for example, page 11, line 9 of the originally filed specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, for at least those reasons submitted in the Request for Reconsideration filed on June 22, 2010, as none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the feature of using the relocation instructions in the remapping component (e.g., the DLL) to modify the export data table of the remapping component (e.g., the DLL) itself, so that the relocation instruction inserts into the export data table the address location for the function in the additional DLL. As will be appreciated, the clarifying amendment to Claim 1 clarifies the recitation of this feature in Claim 1. Further, Applicants note that the remarks in the Advisory Action do not make any allegation that any of the cited references teach or suggest this feature, but rather merely alleged that the feature was not actually recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants assume that the Examiner agrees that none of the cited references, taken alone or in combination teach the feature, as Applicants assume the Examiner would have otherwise addressed the feature in conformance with the principles of compact prosecution as set forth in the MPEP .

As such, the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each feature recited in amended Claim 1. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, such that the rejection is overcome. Applicants additionally respectfully submit that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

The Rejection of the Dependent Claims is Overcome

Because each of the dependent claims includes each of the recitations of a respective independent base claim, Applicants further submit that the dependent claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, for at least those reasons discussed above. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of the dependent claims are overcome and the dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

New Claims 11-22 are in Condition for Allowance

New independent Claims 12 and 17 are directed to a method and apparatus, respectively. While Claims 1, 12, and 17 each have their own unique scope, Claims 12 and 17 recite substantially similar features to those addressed above with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12 and 17 are patentably distinct from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, and in condition for allowance for at least those reasons discussed with respect to Claim 1.

New Claims 11, 13-16, and 18-22 each depend from a respective one of the independent claims (Claims 1, 12, and 17) and are therefore patentably distinct from the cited references and in condition for allowance for at least those reasons as are the independent claims. Applicants additionally submit that Claims 11, 13, and 18 are further patentably distinguishable from the cited references, taken alone or in combination. In this regard, Claims 11, 13, and 18 recite features of embodiments disclosed on pages 10 and 11 of the originally filed specification. More particularly, Claims 11, 13, and 18 recite embodiments which may solve the problem when the same ordinal/name location references are used to refer to different functions. The specification recites an example wherein a manufacture of a handset independently used ordinal 77 to refer to a function 'A' and the operating system manufacture also used ordinal 77 to refer to a function 'B.' In such a scenario, it is not possible to support both functions 'A' and 'B' referred to by the same ordinal using a single DLL. Claims 11, 13, and 18 accordingly recite features of embodiments that may solve this problem in such a scenario. None of the cited references, taken alone or in combination, teach or suggest the features recited in Claims 11, 13, and 18.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amended claims and remarks presented above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the present claims of the present application are in condition for immediate allowance. It is therefore respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued. The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to resolve any remaining issues in order to expedite examination of the present application.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles A. Leyes
Registration No. 61,317

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON August 23, 2010.